



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/740,743	12/19/2003	Anil Kumar Chebolu	030701	4930
38516	7590	11/24/2009	EXAMINER	
AT&T Legal Department - SZ Attn: Patent Docketing Room 2A-207 One AT&T Way Bedminster, NJ 07921				NGUYEN, DUSTIN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454			MAIL DATE	
			11/24/2009	PAPER
DELIVERY MODE				

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/740,743	CHEBOLU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	DUSTIN NGUYEN	2454	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4,6-22,24-33 and 35-43 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4,6-22,24-33 and 35-43 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-33, and 35-43 are presented for examination.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed 07/24/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. As per remarks, Applicants argued that (1) Skrepetos blocks Uniform Resource Locators, not "requested computer applications", as recited in independent claims.

4. As to point (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees since as disclosed in the Abstract, Skrepetos clearly discloses a system that blocks unwanted advertisement and information windows while a user is browsing a network [ i.e. requested computer applications as claimed ]. Furthermore, Skrepetos specifically discloses determining is made whether the event corresponds to the network browser creating a new window, a new window may be created when the user clicks a link on a webpage that triggers a new window, or when the user right-clicks and selects "Open in New Window", and if this window is unwanted window, then the window is blocked from activation [ i.e. requested computer application as claimed ] [ 210, 212, Figure 2; 304, Figure 3; and paragraphs 0017, 0018 and 0021 ]. As such, Skrepetos teaches "requested

Art Unit: 2454

computer applications" [ i.e. advertisement or information windows ] as claimed and therefore, the claims remain rejected as written, unpatentable over the cited prior art.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15-20, 22-24, 26-31, 33-35, 37-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heard et al. [ US Patent Application No 2006/0242685 ], in view of Balogh et al. [ US Patent No 7,047,258 ], and further in view Krepelos [ US Patent Application No 2003/0233482 ].

7. As per claim 1, Heard discloses the invention as claimed including a system for

automatically updating of computer access settings [ i.e. automatically push the security policy to the mobile device ] [ 810, Figure 8; Abstract; and paragraphs 0027 and 0030 ], comprising:

at least one computer access setting for a respective user of a computer [ i.e. policy data ]

[ paragraphs 0054, 0055, Permission Policies and Rule Policies tables ], one version of the at

least one computer access setting being stored in a remote database [ i.e. LDAP storage

directory ] [ 108, Figure 1; and paragraphs 0029, 0033, 0044 and 0045 ] and another version of

the at least one computer access setting being stored in the computer [ i.e. the policy data is

Art Unit: 2454

decrypted and stored in the rules engine store ] [ 612, Figure 6; and paragraph 0061, 0062 and 0066 ];

a control unit to communicate with the computer [ i.e. gatekeeper ] [ 104, Figure 1; and paragraphs 0030 and 0031 ] and to automatically update the versions of the at least one computer access settings in the computer and the remote database to coincide with each other responsive to at least one computer event [ i.e. updating policy information and distributing the updated policy information to the mobile device when synchronization ] [ 808, 810, Figure 8; paragraphs 0059, 0073, 0074; and claims 1 and 2 ].

Heard does not specifically disclose  
the at least one control access setting being stored in the remote database is updated to reflect changes made to the at least one control access setting being stored in the computer and vice versa;

Balogh discloses  
the at least one control access setting being stored in the remote database is updated to reflect changes made to the at least one control access setting being stored in the computer and vice versa [ i.e. update the different of data in local and remote databases ] [ Figure 10A; col 11, lines 62-col 12, lines 15; and col 13, lines 27-38 ];

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Heard and Balogh because the teaching of updating data in Balogh would enable the same information to be maintained throughout the system to prevent system corruption.

Heard and Balogh do not specifically disclose

the at least one computer access setting comprising a listing of prohibited computer applications to which access is denied,

the control unit monitoring a request to launch a computer application that would locally run on the computer's operating system, the control unit intercepting a message for opening a window associated with the requested computer application, the control unit intercepting the message before receipt thereof by the computer's internal operating system to prohibit opening the window, the control unit querying the another version of the computer access settings for the requested computer application, and when the requested computer application is not found in the another version of the computer access setting, then the control unit prohibits opening the window associated with the requested computer application to terminate the launch of the requested computer application, as the user is not authorized to access the requested computer application.

Krepetos discloses

the at least one computer access setting comprising a listing of prohibited computer applications to which access is denied [ i.e. URL listed is not allowed ] [ 406, Figure 4; and paragraph 0027 ],

the control unit monitoring a request to launch a computer application that would locally run on the computer's operating system [ i.e. determining whether a request to open browser window ] [ 404, Figure 4; and paragraph 0026 ], the control unit intercepting a message for opening a window associated with the requested computer application, the control unit intercepting the message before receipt thereof by the computer's internal operating system to prohibit opening the window [ i.e. hook into the events stream ] [ paragraphs 0011 and 0014 ],

the control unit querying the another version of the computer access settings for the requested computer application, and when the requested computer application is not found in the another version of the computer access setting, then the control unit prohibits opening the window associated with the requested computer application to terminate the launch of the requested computer application, as the user is not authorized to access the requested computer application [ i.e. block browser window from opening ] [ Figure 4; and paragraphs 0026 and 0029 ].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Heard, Balogh and Krepitos because the teaching of Krepitos blocking of window would enable to enhance the user's web browsing experience and preventing unwanted advertising windows by providing a browser toolbar and browser helper object extension [ Krepitos, paragraph 0002 ].

8. As per claim 2, Heard discloses wherein the at least one computer event includes user log-in on the computer and the computer being connected to the Internet [ i.e. mobile device initiates data synchronization and gatekeeper authenticates mobile device ] [ 810, Figure 8; and paragraphs 0069, 0072 and 0073 ].

9. As per claim 4, Heard discloses wherein the at least one computer event includes the start up of the computer and the computer being connected to the Internet [ i.e. re-authenticate after device has been turn off ] [ Rule Policies table ].

Art Unit: 2454

10. As per claim 6, Heard discloses wherein the computer access settings contain an allow list of information that the respective user is authorized to access [ i.e. list of device that can be communicated with ] [ paragraph 0066 ].

11. As per claim 7, Heard discloses wherein the computer access settings contain a block list of information that the respective user is not authorized to access [ i.e. list of device that cannot be communicated with ] [ paragraph 0066 ].

12. As per claim 8, Heard discloses wherein the computer access settings specify if the respective user is authorized to access a particular computer application [ i.e. control application access and use ] [ Permission Policies table; and paragraphs 0032 and 0054 ].

13. As per claim 9, Krepelos discloses wherein the computer access settings specify if the respective user is authorized to access a particular web site [ i.e. URL listed is not allowed ] [ 406, Figure 4; and paragraph 0027 ].

14. As per claim 11, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Heard discloses means for modifying the first version of the computer access setting [ i.e. modifying security policy ] [ Figure 8; and paragraphs 0071, 0073 and 0074 ].

15. As per claim 12, Heard discloses wherein the second version of the computer access settings contain a history of user computer activity [ i.e. history mobile device user activity ] [

Art Unit: 2454

paragraphs 0075 and 0076 ], the system further comprising means for transferring the second version of the computer access settings to the remote location so that the first version at the remote location is updated to include the history of user computer activity contained in the second version upon the at least one computer event [ i.e. the log file transfers to the server ] [ paragraphs 0058 and 0059 ].

16. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 2.

17. As per claims 15-20, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4-9.

18. As per claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 11.

19. As per claim 24, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 13.

20. As per claims 26-31, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 15-20.

21. As per claim 33, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 11.

Furthermore, Heard discloses querying a remotely located serer for a current time [ i.e. a time stamp from the server is used ]; preventing manipulation of a local clock setting by preferring the current time obtained from the remote server; comparing the current time to the time restrictions [ i.e. monitoring the mobile device clock to prevent time tampering ] [ paragraph 0059 ].

Art Unit: 2454

22. As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 13.

23. As per claims 37-42, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 15-20.

24. Claims 3, 10, 14, 21, 25, 32, 36, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heard et al. [ US Patent Application No 2006/0242685 ], in view of Balogh et al. [ US Patent No 7,047,258 ], and further in view of Krepitos [ US Patent Application No 2003/0233482 ] and Dunn [ US Patent No 7,076,558 ].

25. As per claim 3, Heard, Balogh and Krepitos do not specifically disclose wherein the at least one computer event includes user log-out on the computer and the computer being connected to the Internet. Dunn discloses wherein the at least one computer event includes user log-out on the computer and the computer being connected to the Internet [ i.e. disconnect ] [ col 37, lines 4-11 ]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Heard, Balogh, Krepitos and Dunn because the teaching of Dunn would allow a web services user to control access to user-specific information stored in associated with a software service offered by a web-service provider [ Dunn, col 1, lines 6-10; and col 2, lines 10-21 ].

26. As per claim 10, Dunn discloses wherein the computer access settings specify if the respective user is authorized to access a category of information that includes computer applications and web sites [ col 8, lines 52-61 ].

27. As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 3.
28. As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 10.
29. As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 14.
30. As per claim 32, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 21.
31. As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 14.
32. As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 21.
33. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).  
  
A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dustin Nguyen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454